

1

2

3

4

5

Q

8

[illegible]

9

1

2

3

4

1 was properly allocated to the Medical Assistance Specialist 4 classification. On June 22, 1999,
2 Appellant filed exceptions with the Personnel Appeals Board to the determination of the
3 Department of Personnel. Appellant specifically filed exceptions to the designee's failure to
4 compare his position to similar positions in other agencies; her failure to include the Computer
5 Information Consultant 2 as an allocation option; her conclusion that he did not perform the duties
6 of a Medical Assistance Program Manager 1; and his concerns with the allocating process.

7
8 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant does not dispute that the duties he performs are
9 included in the Medical Assistance Specialist (MAS) 4 classification, however, he argues that the
10 work he performs in the Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) unit is nothing like or
11 on the scale of a lead worker. Appellant argues that the MAS 4s are a "total systems expert" on the
12 entire systems and its many sub-parts. Appellant is involved in designing and developing change
13 requests for mainframe computer systems, developing and maintaining billing instructions,
14 participating in writing for inclusion in the Washington Administrative Code, ensuring that the unit
15 provides accurate billing instructions and performing systems processing through the main frame
16 computer. Appellant asserts that he understands system pricing and takes responsibility for the
17 rates, installation and payments, and if errors are made he is responsible for making the mass
18 adjustments and rectifying the situation. Appellant argues that staff with the Department of Labor
19 and Industries who perform the same duties as MAS 4s at DSHS are paid at eight ranges higher.
20 Appellant also argues that he and his peers have had a long-standing fight for equity which has been
21 largely unsuccessful, that unit staff were not adequately represented during the class study and that
22 they had no voice in the decision to place them in the MAS series. Appellant further argues that
23 with a few well-placed words they could have been placed the MAS 5 classification.

24
25 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that a class study was performed to
26 determine at which class to place Medical Claims Examiners as their duties and responsibilities

1 increased and in an attempt to recruit and retain qualified employees in the series. Respondent
2 contends that the findings of the study resulted in the reallocation of the Medical Claims Examiners
3 to a new series entitled Medical Assistance Specialists. Respondent argues that a number of other
4 specifications were reviewed for the study and this new series more accurately identifies the duties
5 employees were performing. Respondent argues that based on the CQ's submitted for the class
6 study and the job specifications developed, all positions were appropriately placed in the MAS
7 series between levels 1 and 5. Respondent asserts that the MAS 4 classification recognizes specific
8 specializations and that the 5th level is the supervisor of a unit. Respondent argues that based on 75
9 percent of the duties performed by Appellant, his position is best described by the MAS 4
10 classification.

11
12 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
13 to the Medical Assistance Specialist 4 classification should be affirmed.

14
15 **Relevant Classifications.** Medical Assistance Specialist 4, class code 46370; Medical Assistance
16 Specialist 5.

17
18 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
19 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
20 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
21 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
22 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
23 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
24 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
25 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

1 Although Appellant argued that his position was not properly allocated to the MAS 4 classification,
2 he has failed to provide any specific exceptions to illustrate how he has been improperly classified.
3 While Appellant argues that he could have been placed in the MAS 5 classification, specification
4 for this class defines the MAS 5 as the supervisor of a unit which includes a technical Medical
5 Specialist 3 or Medical Assistance Specialist 4. Appellant is not the supervisor of a unit.

6
7 The specification for the class of Medical Assistance Specialist 4 states that the incumbent
8 interprets policy/regulations, analyzes workflow and automated systems problems, devises and
9 implements new and revised procedures and monitors ongoing systems operations in the broader
10 aspects of Medicaid Management Information Systems (MMIS) related activities. Appellant admits
11 that the duties he performs are encompassed in the MAS 4 specification. Appellant's duties are
12 clearly encompassed by the typical work of the MAS 4 classification. Although Appellant stated in
13 his exceptions to the Board that the duties of his position could be classified as Computer
14 Information Consultant 1 duties, he presented no argument during the course of the hearing to
15 support his position.

16
17 Appellant's primary exception is with the class study itself, however, the Board does not have
18 jurisdiction or authority over the of class study process. Furthermore, the Personnel Appeals Board
19 is not the proper entity to rewrite class specifications. Sorenson v. Dep't of Social and Health
20 Services, PAB No. A94-020 (1995).

21
22 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
23 determination dated June 10, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director's determination dated June 10, 1999, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 1999.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

Nathan S. Ford Jr., Member